2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 AL1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

000 The time it was possible to devote to the research, the writing, and the revision has been under two years. I can claim, however, that the application has been intensive.

A survey of this sort accomplished in so short a time had obviously to be in the nature of a *tour de force*. I had, for the most part, to rely on secondary sources and, as was to be expected, there were many gaps in my information. At the best, the impressionism promised to be an imperfect mosaic with some cracked tesserae and blanks in the pattern filled in with the cement of speculation. The information available, too, varied considerably with the countries. However, I hoped to compensate for the limitations of my method as far as possible by obtaining the help of experts in the several countries and fields of knowledge through criticism of the work section by section before publication. This hope proved well founded, for through the good offices of Chatham House and the International Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and by exploiting my personal friendships, I was able to appeal with success to a number of experts in Great Britain, the United States, the Netherlands, France, Canada, South Africa, and the Far East to scrutinize my first drafts, and to supply some of my deficiencies. The comments and suggestions received were of the highest value. I was relieved to find that, on the whole, the essential structure of my individual studies was not undermined by errors in detail. In two cases, indeed, I had courted disaster by trespassing on ground with which I was acquainted only in the most general and imperfect way, but here I was rescued by timely criticism and advice. (A number of my mistakes proved to be derived from the secondary authorities on which I had relied, and I had in some instances to make a choice when these authorities were in conflict.) I have considered carefully every suggestion received, and in the majority of cases have amended my text in the light of the comments made. When, as infrequently happened, my advisers differed, I had also to make a choice between them or to steer a middle course. If errors remain, they are my own.

127 128

000 The brain of the historian (says Edouard Chavannes) is a prism through which are refracted the luminous rays that are the facts; and (he adds) what is important to the reader is to determine the index of refraction of this prism. The above personal details, together with the unconscious self-betrayal of the text, should help the reader in this task.

2:Purcell G-4 (no date) 1951 Al1 Southeast Asia AL1
Chinese

ABBREVIATIONS AND NOTES

113

BEFEO	= *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*
JASB	= *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*
JBRS	= *Journal of the Burma Research Society*
JRAS	= *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JRASSB	= *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch*
JRASMB	= *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Malayan Branch*
JRASNCB	= *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, North China Branch*
JRGS	= *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*

The *Journal of the Indian Archipelago* is sometimes referred to as *Logan's Journal*.

128

CURRENCY

435 The Spanish dollar varied in value, according to the price of silver, between 3*s*. 6*d*. and 4*s*. 6*d*. 4*s*. can be taken as a mean.

436 The rupee = 1*s*. 6*d*. sterling. On 1 April 1947 the currency of Burma ceased to be linked to that of India.

In 1906 the Straits Settlements dollar was fixed at 2*s*. 4*d*. The Straits Settlements dollar was later replaced by the Malayan dollar with the same value, but the sign SS$ is still sometimes used for convenience. M$ is now usual.

At parity there are 11 Siamese bahts (ticals) to the pound sterling.

The official buying rate of the Indochinese piastre in 1949 was 12·55 to the United States dollar.

The official rate of exchange for the guilder (Indonesia) is 10·691 guilders = one pound sterling.

The peso (Philippines) = 50 United States cents.

804

WEIGHTS

128

One picul = 133⅓ lb.[1]
One catty (kati) = 1⅓ lb.
One tahil (tael) = 1⅓ oz.

MEASURES

1 hectare = 2·471 acres.
1 mow = ⅙ of an acre.
1 orlong = (about) ⅔ of an acre.

[1] But the *Statesman's Year-Book* (to which reference should be made for up-to-date information regarding currency, weights and measures, &c.) states that in the Netherlands East Indies 1 picul = 136·16 lb. avoirdupois.

5: Dobby K-4 (no date) 1950 ALl Southeast Asia ALl

PREFACE

121 THE aim of this book is to present a picture of environmental conditions and human adaptations in Southeast Asia which shall provide the student with a basic text and at the same time stimulate the sociologist, the administrator, the politician and the businessman to see the relation of their work to the general field. It is assumed that readers will already know modern writings on the physical, environmental and social aspects of geography, and the text dwells at length only on those circumstances peculiar to Southeast Asia and its people.

This book is not a dictionary, a gazetteer or an encyclopaedia. It is one of the first studies of locational perspectives in Southeast Asia, the critical importance of which became apparent during the last war when the scarcity of information demonstrated how little study had been given to the region as a whole.

128 The book is divided into three parts. The first pictures the natural setting, the second goes from this basis into the human details of each political unit, and the third ties together the social geography of Southeast Asia, to pose some of its present problems.

All money references have been converted into Straits dollars (2s. 4d. or U.S. 47 cents) partly because this currency had wide pre-war usage in the region, partly because it is the one with a simple and fixed relation between its post- and pre-war values. The object has been not to overload the text with statistics which are best obtained fresh from the latest year-books. At every stage in reading this book, reference should be made to the topographic maps of Southeast Asia, which now exist in fair quantity.

000 The author thanks Professor E. G. R. Taylor for her advice on this work and her encouragement at many stages of his career, and Professor L. D. Stamp for his kindness in reading and advising on the manuscript. Those pioneer scholars of the area, whose papers are listed in the bibliography, and upon whose work the author has of necessity drawn liberally for facts, are also thanked. In addition he is heavily indebted to his wife for her continued patience and co-operation at every stage in the production of this book.

18; Firth E-4 (no date) 1950 ALl Southeast Asia ALl

THE PEASANTRY OF SOUTH EAST ASIA [1]

PROFESSOR RAYMOND FIRTH, F.B.A.

000 IF it is not wholly true that the social and economic reconstruction which is so necessary in Asia today must begin with the peasant, it is certain that no programme which omits the peasant can be on firm foundations. The recent history of China is evidence enough for this. My concern, as a social anthropologist, is with the analysis and classification of social relations between people and groups of people, rather than with political or economic affairs as such, although inevitably I cannot dis-
●128 regard them. So my aim is to show briefly some of the most important
121 aspects of the social organization of the South East Asian peasant communities, and of the values by which this organization works. Though the details in my paper refer mainly to Malaya and Indonesia, I think the generalizations have some value for the South East Asian region as a whole.

If the basic features of the peasant society are ignored, one can understand neither the peculiar tenacity which it still possesses in modern conditions, nor the reactions of its members to the increasing impact of ex-
121 ternal economic and political forces. The definition of a peasant is a
565 countryman—a man engaged in rural pursuits, primarily agriculture, with
463 a comparatively simple technology and a special interest in the land he
241 works. In South East Asia one may extend the application of the term to
226 cover the majority of fishermen and even village craftsmen too. They are
32 of the same social class as the agriculturalists, and often members of the same families. As occupational groups, they may even be separable only in theory, since many a peasant farmer is also a fisherman or craftsman by turns, as his seasonal cycle or his cash-needs influence him. What R. H. Tawney has said of agriculture—that it is at once a craft, a business, and a manner of life—can be applied more widely here; the problems of all these peasants alike are partly technical, partly financial and commercial, and partly cultural and social.

162 It is difficult to say just what proportion of the present population of
565 South East Asia may be classed as peasants. It would seem that in nearly
241 every South East Asian country two-thirds or more of the total population
463 is to be found in agricultural communities, tilling the soil. In 1930 the
32 census of Java and Madura in Indonesia gave about 70 per cent of the male
462 workers as dependent for their livelihood on native agricultural output, and about 75 per cent in the regions of Indonesia outside Java and Madura, while large numbers of women were engaged in home craft production. In Siam, in about 1930, almost 90 per cent of the population lived in agricultural communities, rice production providing the living of about 80 per

[1] Originally delivered at a meeting at Chatham House on 21 February 1950.

121 The exclusive emphasis on marriage as a causative factor
114 in kinship terminology, found both in Rivers and Aginsky though in different form, appears to be losing ground steadily; cf. the excellent studies by Tax, Eggan, McAllister, Opler, and Gilbert (in Eggan, 1937) and Opler (1937).

121 No use has been made of the terms "classificatory" and
128 "descriptive", each of which has acquired so wide a range of
60 connotations as to have lost all preciseness. The term "analytical" is used in its basic linguistic sense, e.g. "father's brother" is an analytical term, whereas "uncle" is a primary term. Note that a term may be only partly analytical, e.g. "uncle's son", where the fully analytical term would be "father's brother's son" or "mother's brother's son".

Three types of terminological equations are distinguished, as follows:

1. Categorical equation: equation of members of the two different categories of kin (consanguineal and affinal), e.g. "mother's brother"= "father-in-law".

2. Lineal equation: equation of members of two different lines of descent, e.g. "brother"= "father's sister's son", "son"= "brother's son".

3. Serial equation: equation of members of two different generations, e.g. "son"= "grandson".

These terms are to be regarded as convenient tags of some use in describing patterns of nomenclature, e.g. the Omaha and Crow types are characterized by serial equations in the cross collateral lines. The equation may rest on the extension

121 of a term through analogy or teknonymy, e.g. "grandfather" =
128 "father-in-law" (teknonymy) or on the merging of the referents,
601 e.g. "mother's brother" = "father-in-law" in a group practising cross-cousin marriage. One's explanation of a given system of nomenclature depends in large measure on his analysis of these factors, and one must guard against a premature assumption in either direction. Other equation categories can be established, e.g. the equation of elder and younger siblings, but those cited above have proved to be the most useful.

A final word remains to be said with regard to the system of notation employed. For each language considered in detail, a table of terms is drawn up, with those referring to female kin on the left, those referring to male kin on the right, and those without sex specification (neuter) in the center. This simple arrangement permits of rapid inspection of the table, and is more convenient than the charts of which kinship theorists are so fond. In the notation itself an attempt has been made to get away from the "bastard algebra of kinship", to use Malinowski's phrase (p. 19). Primary English terms are represented by capital letters, and English categorical terms by small letters. Since terms such as "aunt", "uncle", and "cousin" are often found in our sources, these have been retained in our notation. The letter N is used for "nephew, niece" (i.e. neuter), Ne for "nephew", Ni for "niece", and the cousin terms are formed analogically, viz. C "cousin (neuter)", Ce "cousin (male)", Ci "cousin (female)". Cf. also the parallelism in Si "sister" (S "son").

viii

Kinship Notation

121 A aunt

128 B brother

197 C cousin

601 Ce cousin (male)

Ci cousin (female)

Ch child

D daughter

(ds) (different sex from speaker's)

F father

G grand-

l -in-law

M mother

N nephew or niece

Ne nephew

Ni niece

(os) (older than speaker)

p parallel

P parent

S son

Sb sibling

Si sister

Sp spouse

(ss) (same sex as speaker's)

U uncle

x cross

(ys) (younger than speaker)

Bibliography

113 Aginsky, B. W.

1935a. Kinship Systems and the Forms of Marriage. MAAA 45.

1935b. The Mechanics of Kinship. AA 37. 450-57.

1938. Time Levels in Societal Analysis. AA 41. 416-32.

Davis, K. and Warner, L.

1937. Structural Analysis of Kinship. AA 39. 291-313.

Eggan, Fred (ed.)

1937. Social Anthropology of North American Tribes. Chicago.

SECTION A

TIBETO-BURMAN

1. Introduction

121
128 The Tibeto-Burman family of languages represents the center of gravity of the Sino-Tibetan-Karen-Thai linguistic complex (Indo-Chinese) and thus makes an ideal focal point in our study of kinship terminology in southeastern Asia. The diversity within this family, roughly comparable with that of Indo-European, has given rise to great terminological variation, the interpretation of which involves an historical perspective. Tibeto-Burman, therefore, provides a testing-ground for methods as well as a point of departure, and an analysis of kinship nomenclature in this Western division of Indo-Chinese yields a framework within which the nomenclatures of Karen, Chinese, and Thai, or the Eastern division of the group, can be defined.

Tibeto-Burman studies have suffered somewhat from the undue prominence given to Chinese by the epoch-making work of Bernhard Karlgren and Henri Maspero. The classic contribution in the field, Conrady's analysis of the so-called "causative-denominative" formation, is concerned almost exclusively with morphological aspects. The same may be said of the more recent and much more substantial studies by Wolfenden, while Houghton's interesting article on

121 "linguistic palaeontology" is essentially devoted to
128 semantics. Other studies in the general field, with the exception of those noted below, are entirely superficial and need not be cited here. The fact that a sound morphological and semantic analysis can proceed only from a sound phonological basis has gone largely unheeded by students of Tibeto-Burman linguistics. The writer, working in collaboration with Mr. Robert Shafer, has attempted to supply this basis. The fruit of their joint effort is embodied in the Sino-Tibetan Linguistics series as well as in individual articles by the co-authors. This series of volumes, as specified in the bibliography appended to the present introduction, covers most of the Tibeto-Burman divisions, the major exceptions being Miri-Dafla, Konyak (East Naga), Lepcha (Rong), and Lui (Kadu). The results achieved in the Sino-Tibetan Linguistics series are in no sense definitive, but a number of broad phonetic generalizations have been attained and in some instances rather detailed phonetic analyses have been completed. In the present study the writer has refined the analysis at many points and has in some places arrived at new interpretations, while the phonological treatment of Miri-Dafla, Lepcha, and other groups is presented here for the first time.

197 The Tibeto-Burman languages, like Karen, Chinese, and Thai, are characterized by the presence of monosyllabic roots and the employment of distinctive tones (tonemes).

197 like that in Indo-European linguistics, i.e. several large well-defined groups and various smaller groups can be pointed out, but, with the exception of a few specific similarities, the exact genealogies of these groups cannot be traced. The 128 197 main divisions of Tibeto-Burman and the approximate positions of some of the key languages are indicated on the appended language list and map. This list includes only those languages for which kinship material is given and is in no sense complete. This material has been arranged with a view to guiding the reader through the maze of Tibeto-Burman linguistics, hence the transitions are both geographical and philological. First the important Tibetan group and its aberrant dialects are considered, thus yielding a yardstick of comparison against which other systems can be collated. Proceeding then to the south, we discuss the chain of languages spoken in the sub-Himalayan area, from west to east, ending with the Miri group in northern Assam. The linguistic affiliations follow much the same pattern, inasmuch as the languages of Kanauri type in the western sub-Himalayas approach Tibetan while those in the eastern sub-Himalayas (Nepal) show affiliations rather with the languages of Assam and Burma. The Kachin group, which stands at the "linguistic crossroads" of Tibeto-Burman, forms the natural transition to Nung and Burmese on the one hand, and to Konyak and Barish on the other. Lastly, the Kukic complex of languages, including Kuki-Chin, Naga,

128 Mikir, and Meithei, round out our picture of Tibeto-Burman
197 kinship terminology as a whole. As new material is presented in connection with each group taken up for discussion, recapitulatory remarks are added to tie the argument together, and a general summary is offered at the end.

Bibliography

113 Benedict, Paul K.

1939. Semantic Differentiation in Indo-Chinese. HJAS 4. 213-29.

1940. Studies in Indo-Chinese Phonology. HJAS 5. 101-27.

Conrady, August

1896. Eine indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ Bildung und ihr Zusammenhang mit den Tonaccenten. Eine Beitrag zur vergleichenden Grammatik der indochinesischen Sprachen, insonderheit des Tibetischen, Barmanischen, Siamesischen und Chinesischen. Leipzig.

Houghton, Bernhard

1896. Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Palaeontology. JRAS (1896). 23-55.

Laufer, Berthold

1915. The Prefix s- in the Indo-Chinese Languages. JRAS (1915), Misc. Communications. 757-80.

104

128 197

23 Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 All Southeast Asia All

1. Tibetan	12. Dafla	23. Lisu	33. Lushei
2. Tsangla	13. Digaru	24. Nyi	34. Lakher
3. Gyarung	14. Aka	25. Ahi	35. Thado
4. Kanauri	15. Dhimal	26. Moso	36. Sho
5. Byangsi	16. Kachin	27. Chang	37. Khami
6. Baking	17. Nung	28. Garo	38. Tangkhul
7. Vayu	18. Burmese	29. Bodo	39. Empeo
8. Newari	19. Maru	30. Mikir	40. Angami
9. Magari	20. Phunoi	31. Meithei	41. Sema
10. Lepcha	21. Akha	32. Mru	42. Ao
11. Abor-Miri	22. Lahu		

10B

23: Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 All Southeast Asia All

Language List:

Abor-Miri 11. Ahi 25. Aka 14. Akha 21. Angami 40. Ao 42. Baking 6. Bodo 29. Burmese 18. Byangsi 5. Chang 27. Dafla 12. Dhimal 15. Digaru 13. Empeo 39. Garo 28. Gyarung 3. Kachin 16. Kanauri 4. Khami 37. Lahu 22. Lakher 34. Lepcha 10. Lisu 23. Lushei 33. Magari 9. Maru 19. Meithei 31. Mikir 30. Moso 26. Mru 32. Newari 8. Nung 17. Nyi 24. Phunoi 20. Sema 41. Sho 36. Tangkhul 38. Thado 35. Tibetan 1. Tsangla 2. Vayu 7.

128
197